

Applicant : Michael Meiresonne  
Appln. No. : 09/938,163  
Page : 17

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-54 remain present in this application, all of which have been rejected. In the present Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to; the specification was objected to because it contained an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code; the specification was objected to at page 5, line 24, as the phrase “‘service Website 10’ failed to disclose figure 1 which related to this reference;” claim 7 was objected to as it was written to depend upon itself; claims 1-10 and 14-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being obscure for including the term “substantially” within the claim (or depending upon a claim that includes the term “substantially”) and claim 16 was rejected for having insufficient antecedent basis for the phrase “a description of information regarding the supplier corresponding to the supplier;” claims 1-6, 8-17, 24-34, 36-46 and 48-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,662,192 (hereinafter Rebane) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194151 (hereinafter Fenton); and claims 7, 18-23, 35 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rebane in view of Fenton and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194601 (hereinafter Perkes).

Applicant has amended the title of the invention to address the objection to the title. With respect to the objection to the specification for including embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable code, Applicant has amended the specification to address the objection to the embedded hyperlinks contained therein. Applicant has also amended the first paragraph of the Detailed Description to address the Examiner’s objection to the specification.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to depend on claim 6. While Applicant does not agree that the inclusion of the term “substantially” in claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 35, 36, 40, 41, 47, 49, 51 and 53 makes these claims indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has nevertheless amended the claims to remove the term “substantially,” as doing so does not affect the scope of the claims. As such, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 1-10 and 14-53 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is now moot. Applicant has also amended claims 49 and 51 to correct a minor typographical error, changing the word “convention” to “conventional.”

Applicant : Michael Meiresonne  
Appln. No. : 09/938,163  
Page : 18

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 24, 36, 49, 51 and 53, as being unpatentable over Rebane in view of Fenton, Applicant submits that neither Rebane nor Fenton, or the combination thereof, teach or suggest a directory website that comprises a directory website domain name that is at least partially descriptive of a class of goods or services (see, for example, Applicant's Fig. 1, items 6a-6f). Applicant notes that Rebane is primarily directed to a system and method that relate to collecting, evaluating and presenting data and generating information relating to electronic commerce. More specifically, Rebane is directed to data gathering, processing and evaluation systems that quickly alert businesses to incipient trends in their business activities and marketplace so that appropriate action may be taken to protect the advance of a business' well-being. As is disclosed, Rebane attempts to provide a system that allows a business to predict growth rates and limits of variables relating to the business or marketplace. Further, Applicant submits that neither Rebane nor Fenton, or the combination thereof, teach or suggest a supplier descriptive portion located adjacent to a corresponding supplier link (see, e.g., Applicant's Fig. 2, Items 20a-20f).

Applicant notes that Fenton is directed to a website, whose content includes a content associated meta-data that is dynamically incorporated into an index that is searchable within a hierarchical tree structure, which is displayed to a user. While Fenton does disclose rollover display boxes, the teachings of Fenton, in combination with Rebane, do not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed subject matter. For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 11, 24, 36, 49, 51 and 53 are allowable over the combination of Rebane and Fenton.

With respect to the rejection of independent claims 19 and 22, as being obvious over Rebane in view of Fenton and in further view of Perkes, Applicant submits that while Perkes teaches descriptive metatags, it does not, in combination with Fenton and Rebane, as is discussed above, teach or suggest a website having a directory website domain name that is at least partially descriptive of a class of goods or services. Further, as is discussed above, neither Rebane or Fenton, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest directory websites that have a plurality of supplier descriptive portions adjacent to a link that accesses the website having information regarding the supplier. For at least these reasons, independent claims 19 and 22 are also allowable. Additionally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-10, 12-18,

Applicant : Michael Meiresonne  
Appln. No. : 09/938,163  
Page : 19

20, 21, 23, 25-35, 37-48, 50, 52 and 54 depend upon allowable claims and, for at least this reason, are also allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that this reply is fully responsive to the above-referenced Office Action.

### CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-54 are now allowable. If the Examiner has any questions or comments with respect to this reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (616) 949-9610.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL MEIRESONNE

By: PRICE, HENEVELD, COOPER,  
DEWITT & LITTON, LLP

07-14-04  
Date

Michael R. Long  
Michael R. Long  
Registration No. 42 808  
695 Kenmoor SE  
P.O. Box 2567  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-2567  
616/949-9610

MRL/saw